

| | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 10/728,580 | DANISHEFSKY ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Emily Bernhardt | 1624 |

All Participants:

Status of Application: _____

(1) Emily Bernhardt.

(3) _____.

(2) Mr. Gershik.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 17 February 2005

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: In reviewing applicants' claims in the after final response the examiner indicated that R1 as benzyl is not seen in the original claims or specification, only R4 as benzyl as previously pointed out by applicants. Thus it was agreed to modify the main claims by inserting after "or" in the R1/R4 definition "additionally R4 is". This will be done via an Examiner's Amendment..